

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review and consideration of the application. The Final Office Action of November 29, 2010 ("Office Action") has been received and its contents carefully noted. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the arguments filed with respect to the previous rejections over prior art were fully considered and persuasive. Applicants thank the Examiner for rejoining claim 2 due its dependency on allowable claim 1. Claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, and 14-20 are pending.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it is the "collection tank" and not the "connection means" that is the structure in combination with the "separating means and containing means" that performs the recited function as suggested by the Examiner on Page 2 of the Office Action. As noted by the Examiner on Page 2 of the Office Action, the specification and drawings support this amendment. Support for this amendment can be found at least on pages 16-19 and throughout the figures. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

Claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the prevalent direction Z is "substantially perpendicular to a base plane on which the unit rests." Support for this amendment can be found at least at Page 8, lines 5-16 of the Specification. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections under Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The Office Action indicated that, as disclosed in the specification and drawings, it is the "collection tank" and not the "connection means" that is the structure in combination with the "separating means and containing means" that performs the recited function of claim 1. The Office Action indicated that correction is necessary. Applicants have amended claim 1 according to the Examiner's suggestion to now claim "a separating means interposed between said collection tank of the tube bundle and said containing means suited to guaranteeing a fluid seal between said collection tank and said containing means." Therefore, Applicants respectfully

request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 of claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, and 14-20.


Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 of the Office Action. Therefore, as noted in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, and 14-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' undersigned attorneys and agents by telephone if there any additional concerns with the claims as currently presented.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests a timely allowance of the pending claims. If there are any fees (such as necessary extension of time or extra claims fees) due in connection with the filing of this Response that are not covered by the concurrently submitted transmittal document, please charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1349. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorneys and agents by telephone to discuss any matters if the Examiner feels such discussions may expedite the progress of the present application toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 31, 2011

By: 

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-637-5600
Facsimile: 202-637-5910
email: dcptopatents@hoganlovells.com
Customer No.: **24633**

Celine Jimenez Crowson
Registration No. 40,357